

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL GONZALEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-07423-JSC

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' SECOND
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 589

On August 19, 2025, the Court held an evidentiary hearing regarding the County's motion to enforce the settlement agreement. The motion was resolved at the hearing and Plaintiffs were ordered to file their amended motion for preliminary approval of the class action settlement and motion for attorneys' fees and costs by September 11, 2025. (Dkt. No. 588.) While Plaintiffs filed their second amended motion for preliminary approval on this date, there are several issues with Plaintiffs' filing:

1. The motion states the settlement agreement is attached as Exhibit A, but there is nothing submitted as Exhibit A. (Dkt. No. 589-2)
2. The motion also states the settlement agreement may not be final as it is awaiting review by Alameda County Counsel. (Dkt. No. 589 at 2.)
3. The proposed class notice attached to the motion appears to be a generic notice that is not tailored to this case. (Dkt. No. 589-4.)
4. The motion was not served on Darryl Geyer as previously ordered. (Dkt. No. 588; Dkt. No. 590.)

In addition, Plaintiffs did not file their motion for attorneys' fees and costs as ordered. (Dkt. No. 588.) The motion for preliminary approval appears to suggest that Plaintiffs' counsel is

no longer seeking any attorneys' fees and costs and all the settlement funds are to be awarded to the named Plaintiffs, but this is unclear, especially as the settlement agreement has not been provided. (Dkt. No. 589 at 9.) Further, it is contrary to Plaintiffs' counsel's previous representations in this case. (Dkt. No. 510 (12/12/24 hearing wherein Ms. Huang represented the \$300,000 the County agreed to pay to resolve Plaintiffs' claims was only for her own attorney's fees and costs with no money going towards damages for the individual Plaintiffs); Dkt. No. 553 (5/22/25 hearing wherein Ms. Huang made the same representation).¹) Indeed, the Court held an evidentiary hearing on the motion to enforce the purported settlement agreement precisely because Ms. Huang insisted all \$300,000 the County agreed to pay was solely for her attorneys' fees. (Dkt. No. 554.)

Accordingly, Plaintiffs are ordered to file a supplemental brief in support of their second amended motion for preliminary approval by September 29, 2025. Plaintiffs shall attach the approved settlement agreement and ensure the motion is served on Mr. Geyer as well as the remaining named Plaintiffs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 16, 2025


JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States District Judge

¹ While there are no transcripts of the hearings, they were recorded on Zoom and thus are available for the Court to review and any party to order a transcript.